

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,559	08/22/2003	Masayoshi Nishio	0229-0773P	9174
2292	7590 05/19/2004		EXAM	INER _
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH			BLAU, STEPHEN LUTHER	
PO BOX 747 FALLS CHU	RCH, VA 22040-0747		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		3711	

**DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004** 

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/645,559	NISHIO, MASAYOSHI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Stephen L. Blau	3711			
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from tute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	ely filed  will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.  (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is in condition for allow	<del>'</del> _				
Disposition of Claims					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd 5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7-9</u> is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	6) Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 October 2003 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.  11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected he drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ection is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>					
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0		(PTO-413) te atent Application (PTO-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)  Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/645,559

Art Unit: 3711

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of 2001-286585 and Kobayashi.

Fenton discloses a shaft length of 43 inches (Fig. 6), and a torque of 2.5 to 4.1 degrees (Col. 5, Lns. 29-31).

Fenton lacks a club length from 43-48 inches, a head volume not less than 250 cc, and a torque which meets the equations as defined in claim 1.

2001-286585 discloses a head having a head volume not less than 250 cc in the form of 360 ml or more (English Solution), and a distance between a gravity point of a head and a center line of a shaft being 45 mm or less (English Solution) in order to have a head with a high inertial moment, light weight and short distance of center of gravity in spite of a large volume (English Abstract). In view of the reference of 2001-286585 it would have been obvious to modify the club of Fenton to have a head having a head volume of 360 ml or more and a distance between a gravity point of a head and a center line of a shaft being 45 mm or less in order to have a head with a high inertial moment,

Application/Control Number: 10/645,559

Art Unit: 3711

light weight and short distance of center of gravity in spite of a large volume. As such the club would meet the relationship between torque and a distance between a gravity point of a head and a center line of a shaft as defined in claim 1.

Kobayashi discloses a head with a shaft being inserted to the sole or close to (Fig. 4). In view of the patent of Kobayashi it would have been obvious to have a shaft secured to a head at or close to a sole of a head in order to have more area between a shaft and head to secure the head and shaft together. As such the shaft and club lengths will both be about 43 inches.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fenton in view of 2001-286585 and Kobayashi as applied to claims 1-2 and 4-6 above, and further in view of Oonuki.

Fenton lacks a gravity point distance L being in a range of from 33-41 mm. 2001-286585 discloses a distance between a gravity point of a head and a center line of a shaft being 45 mm or less (English Solution) in order to have a head with a high inertial moment, light weight and short distance of center of gravity in spite of a large volume (English Abstract). Oonuki discloses a gravity point distance L being in a range of from 20-50 mm (Col. 2, Lns. 23-35). In view of the references of 2001-286585 and Oonuki it would have been obvious to modify the club of Fenton to have a gravity point distance L being in a range of from 33-41 mm in order to have a head with a high inertial moment, light weight and short distance of center of gravity in spite of a large volume.

Application/Control Number: 10/645,559

Art Unit: 3711

## Allowable Subject Matter

Page 4

4. Claims 7-9 are allowed. None of the prior art discloses or renders as obvious a method of making a club with a step of examining whether the torque and gravity point distance satisfies the equations as defined in claim 7 in addition to the other elements of structure claimed.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Blau whose telephone number is (703) 308-2712. The examiner is available Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.. If the examiner is unavailable you can contact his supervisor Greg Vidovich whose telephone number is (703) 308-1513. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858. (TC 3700 Official Fax 703-872-9306)

slb/ 16 May 2004

STEPHEN BLAU PRIMARY EXAMINER